



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,365	09/15/2003	Joerg Beringer	09282.0014-00000	1645
22852	7590	05/28/2008		
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413				
EXAMINER				
LONG, ANDREA NATAE				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2176				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/28/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/663,365

Applicant(s)

BERINGER ET AL.

Examiner

Andrea N. Long

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/20/2007 02/26/2008 05/01/2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 19-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S5108)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 05/01/2008
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

FINAL ACTION

Applicant's Response

In Applicant's Responses dated 11/20/2007 and 02/26/2008, Applicant amended Claims 1 and 10, and argued against all objections and rejections previously set forth in the Office Action dated 08/20/2007.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Group II, claims 19-25 in the reply filed on 11/20/2007 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that "both Groups are disclosed as related subject matter, and accordingly do not warrant any additional search of the art". This is not found persuasive because inventions having common features are not demonstrative of lack of patentable distinction. Further the two inventions are classified in two different classes, Group I - 715/739 and Group II - 717/132. In particular Group I is only directed to defining a resource template for locating resources, while Group II focuses in a different direction of a graphical approach of a modeling process (phases, flow blocks, and steps). The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: the recited "*medium*" of Claim 10. The Specification does not mention the recited "*medium*." Thus, there is no support or antecedent basis for the recited "*medium*" that allows the meaning of the term to be ascertained, as required in 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

For the convenience of the Applicant, the Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior art(s) of record in the body of this action. Although the specified citations are representations of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. The Applicant should consider the entire reference(s) as applicable as to the limitations of the claims.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coiera et al. (US 2005/0086204 A1), hereinafter “Coiera” in view of Fontana et al (US Patent 6167564), hereinafter “Fontana”.

As to independent claim 1, Coiera discloses *a method comprising defining a set of attributes associated with at least one resource* (p. 3 paragraph [0045] through [0053] Fig. 6 → Coiera discloses that the profile consists of attributes such as date, duration, etc, which is used to search for resources which he calls sources); *associating a set of constraints with the attributes, the constraints corresponding to a context* (p. 3 paragraph [0037][0055] Fig. 6 → Coiera uses parameters as constraints for the attributes in a profile. Coiera further discloses that the search is dependent on the profile which includes the constraints for the attributes, once that profile is obtained then the context “data within the database to be searched” corresponding to the profile) *and being defined by a resource template* (Fig. 6, p. 3 paragraph [0045] → Coiera uses a graphical user interface as the resource template. In accordance with the Applicant's

specification the resource template may be represented by a graphical object on a computer display device); *determining that a resource matches the set of attributes and constraints* (p.4 paragraph [0062] → Coiera discloses a search engine which uses the profile with which attributes and parameters are stored); *and displaying the matching resource as a selectable resource graphical object on a user device* (p. 4 paragraph [0063], [0064] → Coiera discloses that the results are displayed by the interface). Coiera additionally discloses that the main purpose of creating the template is to receive resources that will allow for medical professionals to make clinical decisions (page 1 paragraph [0003]), which reasonably provides insight to one skilled in the art that *completion of a workflow process is contingent on the matching resource*. However, Coiera does not teach wherein the determining is performed in an enterprise management system.

Fontana teaches *an enterprise management system that comprises cross-functional applications to manage at least one resource* (column 2 lines 61-65 → Fontana teaches a system that build maintains and deploys business process applications), *the cross-functional applications comprising; a user interface* (Fig. 6 column 5 lines 42-48) *for linking objects of an object modeling tool with workflow of the process modeling tool* (column 3 lines 1-17, column 7 lines 25-60 → Fontana teaches linking domains, business models and components as part of the application's development).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the resource template of Coiera with the enterprise management system of

Fontana to provide a defined business process, which can be implemented within multiple applications.

As to dependent claim 2, Coiera teaches wherein *defining the set of attributes comprises receiving information that defines an object class of the at least one resource* (p. 3 paragraph [0041], Fig 5 reference character 104 → Coiera discloses using a profile window and an advanced window search which allows a user to select searches which relate to a specific profile of attributes and parameters).

As to dependent claim 3, Coiera teaches *receiving information that defines an attribute associated with the object class* (p. 3 paragraph [0045] through [0053], Fig. 6 → Coiera discloses that the profile consists of attributes such as date, duration, etc, which is used to search for resources which he calls sources).

As to dependent claim 4, Coiera teaches *receiving information from a user device with a graphical display having an active area for the input of the information* (p.3 paragraph [0045], Fig 6 → Coiera discloses by his figures the fields that have user input which would be inputted with a keyboard or selected with a mouse).

As to dependent claim 5, Coiera teaches *displaying a selectable template graphical object on a graphical display device prior to the determining that a resource matches, the template graphical object representing an active area associated with the defined resource* (Fig.

7 reference characters 210, 211 → Coiera discloses in the figure the user input fields which are used to collect search criteria from the user before implementing a search).

As to dependent claim 6, Coiera teaches *defining the set of attributes comprises determining the set of attributes based on a profile of a user's interaction with a user device* (p.3 paragraphs [0045], [0054] → Coiera discloses the attributes correspond to a profile which can be saved for future uses and that the user can search keywords which are entered or selected by the user).

As to dependent claim 7, Coiera teaches *receiving a selection of the resource template and executing an application associated with the found resource* (p. 4 paragraphs [0063], [0064] → Coiera discloses displaying the search results in which the results may include a link which would execute the opening if the full document).

As to dependent claim 8, the Applicant discloses the resource templates may provide assistance within a guided procedure by limiting the set of proposed values to the pre-defined constraints. Coiera teaches *executing an application comprises executing the application with a guided procedure workflow* (Fig. 5 reference characters 100 & 104, Fig 6 reference characters 108 & 200 → Coiera discloses the guided procedure of limiting the constraints of an attribute for example "source" In Fig 6 has limited constraints for selection by the user).

As to dependent claim 9, Coiera teaches *wherein the resource comprises a datum* (p. 3 paragraphs [0063], [0064] → Coiera discloses that more detail information can be retrieved by selecting a link).

As to independent claim 10, Coiera discloses an *article comprising a machine-readable medium including machine-executable instruction* (p. 2 paragraphs [0033], [0034] → Coiera discloses a computing system to implement his searching system) *operative to cause a machine to define a set of attributes associated with at least one resource* (p. 3 paragraph [0045] through [0053] Fig. 6 → Coiera discloses that the profile consists of attributes such as date, duration, etc, which is used to search for resources which he calls sources); *associate a set of constraints with the attributes, the constraints corresponding to a context* (p. 3 paragraph [0037] [0055] Fig. 6 → Coiera uses parameters as constraints for the attributes in a profile. Coiera further discloses that the search is dependent on the profile which includes the constraints for the attributes, once that profile is obtained then the context “data within the database to be searched” corresponding to the profile) *and being defined by a resource template* (Fig. 6, p. 3 paragraph [0045] → Coiera uses a graphical user interface as the resource template. In accordance with the Applicant’s specification the resource template may be represented by a graphical object on a computer display device); *determine that a resource matches the set of attributes and constraints* (p.4 paragraph [0062] → Coiera discloses a search engine which uses the profile with which attributes and parameters are stored); *and display the matching resource as a selectable resource graphical object on a user device* (p. 4 paragraph [0063], [0064] → Coiera discloses that the results are displayed by the interface). Coiera additionally discloses that the main purpose of

creating the template is to receive resources that will allow for medical professionals to make clinical decisions (page 1 paragraph [0003]), which reasonably provides insight to one skilled in the art that *completion of a workflow process is contingent on the matching resource*. However, Coiera does not teach wherein the determining is performed in an enterprise management system.

Fontana teaches *an enterprise management system that comprises cross-functional applications to manage at least one resource* (column 2 lines 61-65 → Fontana teaches a system that build maintains and deploys business process applications), *the cross-functional applications comprising: a user interface* (Fig. 6 column 5 lines 42-48) *for linking objects of an object modeling tool with the workflow of the process modeling tool* (column 3 lines 1-17, column 7 lines 25-60 → Fontana teaches linking domains, business models and components as part of the application's development).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the resource template of Coiera with the enterprise management system of Fontana to provide a defined business process, which can be implemented within multiple applications.

As to dependent claim 11, Coiera teaches wherein *instructions operative to cause a machine to define the set of attributes comprise instructions operative to cause a machine to receive information that defines an object class of the at least one resource* (p. 3 paragraph [0041], Fig 5 reference character 104 → Coiera discloses using a profile window and an

advanced window search which allows a user to select searches which relate to a specific profile of attributes and parameters).

As to dependent claim 12, Coiera teaches *instructions operative to cause a machine to receive information that defines an attribute associated with the object class* (p. 3 paragraph [0045] through [0053], Fig. 6 → Coiera discloses that the profile consists of attributes such as date, duration, etc, which is used to search for resources which he calls sources).

As to dependent claim 13, Coiera teaches *instructions operative to cause a machine to receive information comprise instructions operative to cause a machine to receive information from a user device with a graphical display having an active area for the input of the information* (p.3 paragraph [0045], Fig 6 → Coiera discloses by his figures the fields that have user input which would be inputted with a keyboard or selected with a mouse).

As to dependent claim 14, Coiera teaches *instructions operative to cause a machine to display a selectable template graphical object on a graphical display device prior to the determining that a resource matches, the template graphical object representing an active area associated with the defined resource* (Fig. 7 reference characters 210, 211 → Coiera discloses in the figure the user input fields which are used to collect search criteria from the user before implementing a search).

As to dependent claim 15, Coiera teaches *instructions operative to cause a machine to define the set of attributes comprise instructions operative to cause a machine to determine the set of attributes based on a profile of a user's interaction with a user device* (p.3 paragraphs [0045], [0054] → Coiera discloses the attributes correspond to a profile which can be saved for future uses and that the user can search keywords which are entered or selected by the user).

As to dependent claim 16, Coiera teaches *instructions operative to cause a machine to receive a selection of the resource template, as receiving a selection from the resource template being the results from the search of the resource template, and executing an application associated with the found resource* (p. 4 paragraphs [0063], [0064] → Coiera discloses displaying the search results in which the results may include a link which would execute the opening if the full document).

As to dependent claim 17, Coiera teaches *instructions operative to cause a machine to execute an application comprise instructions operative to cause a machine to execute the application with a guided procedure workflow* (Fig. 5 reference characters 100 & 104, Fig 6 reference characters 108 & 200 → Coiera discloses the guided procedure of limiting the constraints of an attribute for example “source” In Fig 6 has limited constraints for selection by the user). Note the discussion above in claim 8 about defining a guided procedure.

As to dependent claim 18, Coiera teaches *wherein the resource comprises a datum* (p. 3 paragraphs [0063], [0064] → Coiera discloses that more detail information can be retrieved by selecting a link).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/20/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant asserts that Coiera in view of Fontana fails to suggest the limitation "completing workflow of a process modeling tool by using the matching resource".

The Examiner disagrees.

The Coiera reference provides reasonable and sufficient knowledge of a workflow process. While the terms "workflow" and "process" are not explicitly used in the disclosure of Coiera, there is provided in the background information that the resources that are found are used to aid medical professionals in making clinical decisions. The use of the matching resources in this situation provides for completion of someone making a decision. With this knowledge along with the teachings of Fontana system of discovering applications or locating artifacts as pointed out by the Applicant, the use of the matching resources completes workflow of a process modeling tool.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrea N. Long whose telephone number is 571-270-1055. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs 6:00 am to 3:00 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Andrea Long
May 20, 2008

/Doug Hutton/
Doug Hutton
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100